



## South Truckee Meadows/Washoe Valley Citizen Advisory Board

**DRAFT:** Approval of these draft minutes, or any changes to the draft minutes, will be reflected in writing in the next meeting minutes and/or in the minutes of any future meeting where changes to these minutes are approved by the CAB. Minutes of the regular meeting of the South Truckee Meadows Citizen Advisory Board held February 12, 2015 at the South Valleys Library at 15650A Wedge Parkway, Reno, Nevada

**1. \*CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM –** The meeting was called to order at 6:10pm by Chair person, Patricia Phillips.

**Member Present:** Patricia Phillips, Kathie Roberts, Jim Rummings, Eric Scheetz, Brad Stanley, Thomas Daly, Thomas Judy, Patrick Ty Whitaker. A quorum was determined. **Absent members:** Dennis Wilson, At-Large, Steven Miles, At-Large Alternate, Kimberly Rossiter At-Large Alternate.

**2. \*PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. \*PUBLIC COMMENT –**

Ginger Pierce spoke about cell tower at East Lake Blvd and old 395; there is a cell tower on the corner. She encouraged people to drive over there and look at it.

Cliff Lowe said he has an interest in 8&9 agenda item (The role of CAB and Summit sign). Published in the Reno Gazette Journal; There was an editorial with the pro and cons about the Summit Sign. The General Manager was quoted as well as Laurie Wray from Scenic Nevada. Cliff Lowe read an excerpt from the editorial. He said the editorial mentioned the CAB and said they had met with this group. This will play into items 8&9. The editorial was pertinent to this discussion regarding items 8&9.

Jeff Church said he runs a website: Reno public Safety.org as well as Mt. Rose Scenic Corridor website. He said Reno is suing Washoe County over fire services, yet Washoe is giving \$1.4 million a year in free crime lab services to Reno. Reno hasn't been paying the bill for the past 9 years. He encouraged everyone to talk to Chuck Allen and your representatives. Why are we giving Reno free services year after year? Sparks and Tribal police pay for Crime lab services. 25-30 agencies pay, except for Reno. Why are we giving them the downtown homeless center at \$1.2 million a year when they are suing us? Reno is \$800Million in debt. According to the NRS 354, Assembly Bill needs to be amended so we don't inherit those bills if the City goes bankrupt. He asked the board to put on the agenda – crime lab services.

Jeff Church said 3 years ago there was the 632 acre mega development approved by Washoe County on Fawn Lane is now bankrupt. No one knows who owns the land. There is illegal dumping, campers, and shooting.

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF FEBURARY 12, 2015-** Tom Daly made a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting of February 12, 2015; Eric Scheetz seconded the motion to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 13, 2014 and January 8, 2015 –**

**MOTION:** Tom Daly made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of November 13, 2014 with amendments; Kathie Roberts seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of November 13, 2014 as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion regarding the November 13, 2014 minutes:

- Bradley Stanley had a question regarding the minutes: There were four letters submitted, however, those who wrote the letters weren't present, but it just reflected the person's name but not there comments. Where are those records? What is the process for including those letters? Recording Secretary Misty Moga apologized and said she misunderstood the process of submitting the letters, however, the letters were noted in the minutes as being submitted. The process will be changed in the future to capture the thoughts of the public. The letters are submitted to the Commissioner as well as the appropriate County representatives. Sarah Tone reviewed the process for letters in the minutes. She said if someone submits a letter, they can say 'for the record.' She reviewed the minutes and didn't hear that. The letters are kept for records and are submitted to the appropriate staff. The concepts of the letter will be captured in the minutes moving forward in future meetings. Brad Stanley asked about the letters read; Sarah said the public would say 'for the record' if they would like their letter captured word for word. Any letters submitted will be included as a conceptual summary. Tom Judy was concerned about letters not being submitted in the minutes. Misty clarified and apologized for the misunderstanding, and will capture a conceptual summary moving forward.

- Tom Judy asked about the Administrative Permit Case 14-005. John Kymptotic was speaking and Eric asked about communications with the neighbors; the minutes should reflect that nobody verbally said anything regarding the project. Tom Judy said people were notified and the minutes should reflect that.
- He said Pat asked about parking on Lake Placid road; the minutes should reflect that Mr. Kymptotic said it should be prohibited. The minutes weren't written clearly.
- The Motion made by Mr. Daly to approve the case item, seconded by Kathie, it was amended; there was no record to show it was approved. That is important to show it was approved.
- During a Public comment item, there was no public comment which needs to be accurately stated. He said he hopes the minutes can be more accurate in the future.
- Brad Stanley said things have changed rapidly; 3 CAB groups have been merged together. There are a diversity of issues and a diversity of points-of-views. He asked Sarah Tone about the process for recording minutes. Sarah said she will defer the discussion until the Role of the CAB item.

MOTION: Tom Judy made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of January 8, 2015 with corrections; Tom Daly seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of January 8, 2015 as amended. The motion carried unanimously

Discussion regarding the January 8, 2015 minutes:

- Brad Stanley asked Sarah about when he had to recused himself to make a public comment about cooperative planning. He asked when that meeting was. Sarah said she believed it was the November meeting.
- Eric Scheetz said he wanted to clarify a portion of the minutes; it should read 'Eric Scheetz is in the Galena Forest area but also represents the Callahan Ranch to Government Lots area.'

## 6. \*COMMISSIONER UPDATE

**A. \*Washoe County Commissioner Update** – Washoe County Commissioner Bob Lucey, District 2, will join the CAB members for an update on neighborhood issues in District 2. Commissioner Lucey and Citizen Advisory Board members will identify community interests and topics. To contact Commissioner Lucey, visit [www.washoecounty.us/bcc](http://www.washoecounty.us/bcc), email: [blucey@washoecounty.us](mailto:blucey@washoecounty.us), or call (775) 328-2005.

Bob Lucey gave an update:

- The County Commissioners and the department heads met in a special meeting. County has a new direction with new commission. Our mentality is to be true stewards and rebrand the county as positive place to be part of. We will make more of an effort to be in attendance at meetings and public appearance with constituents and be true stewards for the constituents. We are making it a priority to do that and take your comments to heart.
- The additional boards he sits on: RSCVA, RTC, Regional Planning, Flood project, Washoe Regional Water Commission, Debt Management, Smarter Regions/Smarter Cities. As a junior Commissioner, he said he has a lot of additional duties. If you have a request from him, he has a lot of things going on. Our district has been hit with a lot of issues that he is working on a daily basis. He said as active CAB members, you are doing a service to the community and you are owed the same respect. We want the same level of professionalism. We work together for the common goal.
- Eric Scheetz asked about any updates on the sign, particularly the Dianda Sign, which we spoke about at the last meeting. Bob Lucey said not in particular. He said they haven't met about the codes yet and those are still in draft form and working on those, but will have an update in the months coming. Mr. Lucey said they are currently in the legislative efforts down in Carson. Majority of our efforts are down in Carson. There are a lot of new commissioners and staff with lots of transformation, so please be patient. We are ending our fiscal year with budgets being submitted. The sign issue has not come to a head yet, and we are still working on it. There was an overwhelming denial of the Summit sign. Eric Scheetz said he has heard from other constituents that they would like to see that sign (Dianda sign) or signs like that go through the same steps as others with special permits.
- Tom Daly asked which commissioners are the liaisons for the legislature. Bob Lucey said Commissioner Berkbigler is the liaison. Additionally, our County Manager John Slaughter and Leanne Lu is our Government affairs liaison for the County commissioners' office.
- Brad Stanley asked about the Smarter Regions/Smarter Cities (IBM) group. Bob Lucey said it's a smaller board; it's an IBM advisory board for new economic development. Brad asked where he can get more information. Sarah said she can get him more information. Brad Stanley said people are impressed with Bob Lucey's involvement.
- Tom Daly wanted to follow up about the fire commissioner and the consolidation of two fire district. The deadline for submission of bills of March 16; who is driving that process. Bob Lucey said Chief Moore is driving that process. Bob said he doesn't know where we are in the process and doesn't know if a BDR has been submitted. Bob said he can provide information before the deadline.

**B. \*County Update** – Sarah Tone did not have anything to report. Please feel free to contact her at [stone@washoecounty.us](mailto:stone@washoecounty.us) or (775) 328-2721. To sign up to receive email updates from the County visit [www.washoecounty.us/cmail](http://www.washoecounty.us/cmail).

## **7. \*PUBLIC SAFETY AND COMMUNITY REPORTS/UPDATES**

**A. \*Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO)** – No representative was present.

**B. \*Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD)** – For more Information about TMFPD is available online at [www.washoecounty.us/tmfpd](http://www.washoecounty.us/tmfpd) or (775) 326-6000. *(This item is for information only and no action will be taken by the CAB.)*

Amy Ray, Fire Marshall for the Truckee Meadow Fire Protection District gave an update:

- She brought free smoke detectors for the public
- We recommend batteries are changed twice a year
- If your smoke detector is more than 10 years, we recommend you replace your detector. Smoke alarms fail after 10 years.
- Opening burning: February 14 – March 15 pilot program. Burn permits will be available online to reduce traffic to the stations. There are two forms to be filled out this year (regular permit and air quality permit). They are working with Washoe County Health and Air Quality. You will have to report if you want to do opening burning between February 14 – March 28; report how much you are going to burn. They want those statistics for air quality. We have to comply with green, yellow, red burn code times. If Washoe County Health declares it is a red day, we have to comply. It has to do with the inversion. We will try to extend those burn times, but please fill out those forms to report burning. Fall is difficult because of the inversion patters. She encouraged everyone to take advantage of the open burn opportunity.
- Chief Moore wants to give an updated on the volunteer program at the next meeting.
- Tom Daly asked if there are any current or planned TMFPD projects in the district between now and July 1<sup>st</sup>. Amy said not that she is aware of

**C. \*Update on Washoe County Regional Parks Issues** – Jennifer Budge, Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space, Parks Operations Superintendent, will provide an update on parks issues including: a citizen concern regarding the man-made obstacles/construction on County property within Thomas Creek Watershed northwest of Arrowcreek Parkway, Jones Creek Trail location as constructed and future opportunities, and community dog park issues in Hidden Valley. For additional information, please contact Jennifer Budge at [jbudge@washoecounty.us](mailto:jbudge@washoecounty.us) or call (775) 328-2181. *(This item is for information only and no action will be taken by the CAB.)*

Jen Budge, Parks Operation Superintendent gave an update:

There has been some Citizens concerns with 3 different topics:

Thomas creek watershed, north of Arrowcreek, and adjacent to Sage Ridge School. The students created art sculptures with rocks with bushes and trees. There was confusion regarding the property boundaries. Jen said she met with the school's faculty and students. The materials have been scattered back around the creek. They did a site visit with the Army Corp of engineers based on the citizen's concerns with the condition of the creek. The Army Corp wasn't concerned about the creek. The stream zone is owned by Washoe County, it's one of the only perennial creeks in the area.

Jones Creek Trail Corridor - the trail was construction in the late 1990s, adjacent to Montreaux subdivision; the trail is ¼ mile. The trail doesn't lead to a regional trail system. With construction in the area at the time, they couldn't obtain the easement to connect it to the regional trail system. At Callahan Park, there is the Galena Trail which is only 1,200 feet away from the Jones Creek Trail. People aren't aware of the proximity to the region trail system. They were receiving a lot of calls; there was a social trail that went through a private property. There is no easement through the private property. There is a trail easement along the Montreaux subdivision. Jennifer said they will have a neighborhood meeting to discuss this and answer questions about the corridor and trail. We can entertain decommissioning that trail if that is the desire. There are options and priorities. Need to make sure the creek isn't too close to the creek; it's not healthy to have a trail next to the creek due to erosion. Pat Phillips asked if there are any trail maps available in Washoe County. Jen Budge said there is a Washoe County parks trail guide. They printed 50,000, and they are almost out. They are printed with grant money. She said you can print one page of an area of the guide online ([washoecountyparks.com](http://washoecountyparks.com)).

Bill Naylor asked about the Scenic Byway. Jen Budge said they received several grants from TRPA (on our way grant) and two scenic byway grants to do Washoe County and Mt. Rose scenic byways management plans. Corridor management addresses 14 points, including marketing, interpretation, recreation, safety improvements, and traffic. The Corridor management plan has to be put into place before they can apply for the grants. Washoe County working group is a partner. They selected Design workshop as the contractor. It will be starting any day now. Cheryl Surface will be the primary contract for both of those plans.

Lynn Cieszko asked a question about the Jones Creek Trail. Years ago there was easement along the Montreaux. Jen said there is a 25 foot easement west of Chateau Lane which includes Jones Creek. Lynn asked for a map. Jen said where the trail is located is not necessarily on the easement, a lot of social trails were created. Lynn said the trail system is important and open. It's important to the community. Jen the current trail is a ¼ mile out and back; the problem is that it's not a legal trail and goes through private property, so there is a concern. Cheryl Surface will have a neighborhood meeting to review the trail and determine the priority. Lynn asked how that meeting will be advertised. Jenn said a public notice will be sent out to homeowners. Jen said she will make sure Lynn is on that list.

Karen Kryter asked about the small county park on East Washoe at Lakeshore. Is there any funding for the Washoe City park. Jen said it's one of the oldest with lots of vandalism. There has been limited residential construction tax in that area, also known as a Park tax, to build new park components less than 25 acres. There limited funds due to little building in the area. We also have it on our CIP budget to improve the equipment. We will see what gets approved through the budget. That playground is on the top two priorities for playground equipment replacement. We are successful when we apply for grants for park improvement. There is limited residential tax for new improvements. It's on our radar.

Hidden Valley Community Dog Park – two off leash areas in Washoe County. San Rafael and Hidden Valley. There was a large contingent of citizens that came forward who wanted an additional dog park. They aren't satisfied with the size of the dog park. They would like more room on the east side. They put out a survey and had a large response. They had a neighborhood meeting with presentation. County park land is under Chapter 95 county code: must have dog on leash unless it's posted in a designated area. The difficulty is with budget reduction in parks, we don't have the rangers to enforce. 13K acres with 14 park rangers. They rely on volunteers and animal services to help enforce rules. Jen said they have been directed to create a stakeholder committee for off leash dog parks which will meet in two weeks. We will create a management plan; the group will consist of technical experts, natural resource experts, citizens, and work as a group. It's a work in progress, but will hopefully have a plan by Fall. Tom Judy asked for date/time/location of the stakeholder meeting. Jen said they haven't scheduled a date yet. It will probably be last weekend in February or first weekend in March.

Cliff Lowe asked about the dog park in Hidden Valley and budgetary constraints. He said Jen made reference to specific pool of funds for used for Washoe City Park. Are they different pool of funds used for the Hidden Valley Park and why? They sound like similar situations. Jen said Hidden Valley is in a different geographic area and a different park district. There are 24 different park districts for the Residential construction tax is based on geography. We are looking to reduce that to 4-6 districts. Hidden Valley is a 488 acre park. Residential Construction Tax is for parks 25 acres or less. We don't have any identified funding. We are working with the citizens for funding and management. Our resources are limited in that area. We want to try to find solutions.

Eric Scheetz asked if there are plans for dog parks in the South West area. Does City of Reno have any? In civil engineering, developments put together drainage basin there are large basins that grab water. Are those opportunities for a dog park? Jen said in the City of Reno has the Virginia lake dog park; and in the City of Sparks, there is one at the Sparks Marina. She said they are underserved for our population. We are hoping to have the Hidden Valley to be a pilot project for the region. Topic of discussion for the Reno, Washoe County, and Sparks Parks Commission is the underserved parks for dogs. She said they are working on the plan to identify parks for dogs. We recognize the needs for off leash areas and have to be thoughtful how we do it. In regards to retention basins, they must be very cautious; not everyone picks up after their dogs. It could create a health and safety concern. Often times our fields are used by sports and then unofficially used by dogs. It's not allowed but not enforced.

Jim Rummings mentioned the disease problem, specifically at park in South Lake Tahoe with Parvo. He asked who monitors these parks. Are you creating a situation where you could have a serious disease outbreak if no one is there to check or spraying? What is the plan? Jen said representatives from Health Department and Animal Services will sit on the committees to help with those questions and management. She said the two parks we have, the Health Department comes regularly and we have the resources for those parks to keep it safe and healthy. Volunteers help to keep the park clean. We hope the efforts continue in all areas. We hope Reno and Sparks take care of their parks as well.

**8. \*THE ROLL OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD** – Commissioner Bob Lucey and Al Rogers, Washoe County Office of the County Manager Management Services Director, will discuss with Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) members the role and function of the CAB program, open meeting law concerns and opportunities to develop in the future. For additional information on this topic, please contact the Office of the County Manager at (775) 328-2000 or email [arogers@washoecounty.us](mailto:arogers@washoecounty.us).

Bob Lucey and Al Rogers led the discussion of the role of CAB within the community:

Bob Lucey said CAB developed for the public to have a voice and concerted effort. This is an advisory board; you can prioritize the issues presented to you by the community and you send the issues to the County Manager and County

Commissioners. There have been issues with jurisdiction; when issues are not pertaining to Washoe County, they cannot be heard by the CAB or Board of County Commissioners. Due to annexation and other entities, there have been difficult property lines drawn and we deal with that on a daily basis, for example, the sign issue. He said the CAB members have handbooks with your roles explained. He asked the CAB to listen and hear their warnings and advice on not taking on certain issues moving forward.

Al Rogers, Director of Management Services, County Manager Office:

- We are in transition with new County Managers and administrative and new commissioners.
- Opportunities for the future: Focusing on Washoe County and taking care of our constituents and focus on the County.
- Reemphasis, through County Code and NRS, we act through CAB to be advisory to the Board of County Commissioners.
- We want to focus on County issues; those that are authorized within our purview of the County. We want to make sure we hear all of our people.
- We are looking to update the handbook with the CABs input to be use as a tool for the board to serve the constituents.
- Open Meeting Law is a tool for the entire board. In the past, the chair and vice chair was required to have, but looking into having the entire board required to have.
- Focus on Washoe County as professional, effective and efficient way.

Questions and Comments:

- Tom Judy said one of the areas that falls into this is Cooperative Planning; he said the city does the determination even though it involves the County. He said the problem is that the County isn't adequately involved. Bob Lucey agreed. He said the County is in transition; they are working with entities of Sparks and Reno to develop current and new relationships. Reno and Sparks are in transition as well with new staff as well. As a community as a whole, we are leaving the past behind, and moving forward. Cooperative Planning is moving forward positively. Regional Planning members include 4 from Reno, 3 from Sparks, 3 from Washoe County, and 1 non-voting from the School District; members on the Truckee Meadow Regional Planning Board act as community advisors, not individual entity advisors.
- Brad Stanley asked about the future, is it the Cooperative Planning or is it Regional Planning who we will be dealing with. Bob Lucey said it's yet to be determined. It's specific to each instance. Bob said we can't overstep our boundary and jurisdiction. It's a fine line. We have to work together, for instance, fire issues we are working to rectify. There will be a new style of doing business. He said we will have to determine who does it directly affect and who should be notified.
- Tom Daly said the County participates in regional planning, flood, health, visitors' authority. He asked if you want the advice of your citizen only when it's regional or only want it of the narrow focus of Washoe County. Bob Lucey said he wants the constituents' voice to be carried out on every issue. Your role is to take the views and opinions of your constituents and compile those as a governing board and decide the biggest issues and bring them to the commissioners. Commissioners are mandated to sit on those boards for representation. Bob said we need to maintain some decorum; we need to work together for a common goal.
- Kathie Roberts said there are times when someone in our area wants to place something on the agenda for discussion. What is the best way to determine if topic is an appropriate item. Bob said as a board, we are subject to NRS, Open Meeting Law and Governing Law. Liability falls on your shoulders as well. If there is an issue of concern that you feel is concerning to a constituent, legal staff that can advise us in that regard.
- Al Rogers said our focus on Washoe County. We need to take a look at the issues and see if it's appropriate for this board to hear. What is the issue? is it within the purview of the Board of County Commissioners? We want to focus on those items, however we want to listen to our constituents concerns, but not necessary make it an action item.
- Pat Philips said we have different issues brought before us and based on our purview, we cannot make an action, however what we say here will be communicated to you. If it's not a County issue, you still hear about it, and we let people have their voice. Al Rogers said he understands. It's more about the information. All that information is passed on to County Commission and they can make decisions in an informed manner.
- Pat Phillips said she would like to see NABs reinstated and meet together with CAB a few times a year on mutual concerns. Bob Lucey said there are concurrent meetings currently with Reno/Sparks. That would be information that would be beneficial and positive to both sides.
- Pat Phillips asked what the steps taken for a CAB agenda item.

Sarah Tone talked about getting items on CAB agenda:

1. Fill out form on the website;

2. There is an agenda item for you to list items of concern; please do not take action on this item. Sarah said she makes the determination on issues and future agenda from the information that is brought to her. She gathers the information and works with representatives.
3. Pat gives final approval and the team releases the agenda.

Pat Philips said she often refer questions to Sarah because she is unable to determine the jurisdiction and possibility; we have to decide on how long the meetings will be; there are some items that aren't emergencies that can be put off to future meetings. Sarah said the length of the agenda and meeting has been a concern; 3 hours is our aim and looking to reduce the meeting length. Some of the items can be resolved without them being an agenda item.

Eric Scheetz thanked them for being here. He said it's wonderful to have you here to be a sounding board for the public. He said in the past, it was important to have the meeting minutes because that was the way it was communicated to you, but now you are here to hear the issues and concerns. Eric said it's very much appreciate you are present. Bob Lucey said they are rebranding the County; our constituents are giving us positive direction. Bob said he will make an effort to attend. We want to add to any conversation at these CABs. Eric Scheetz said it's a good opportunity and privilege to say something. We are advisory for you, this is also the ability for our community to put together ideas and be proactive and discuss what works for people. As you go to regional planning meetings, you can use this information. Bob said wants to bring an update from every board he serves on, as well as other boards he doesn't serve on. That is our role; we are your stewards. We are driving the bus; please tell us where to go.

Eric Scheetz said he feels we are being chastised for the sign issue. He said he looked up the legal definition of a public nuisance; it's a troublesome offense for the whole community and not a particular person. Public nuisance to some people's eyes and we wanted to discuss it together here. Bob Lucey agreed. He said this isn't about chastising the CAB; he said there were actions taken by some members that weren't necessarily the role as a CAB. Action taken after – you can do whatever you want to do as a citizen, when you are acting as a CAB board; action taken after, it can be Bob or the chair. It costs us money to host meetings; work on things we can fix. Please put them in public comment. Jurisdictional law – what we can or cannot do. Eric Scheetz said it was an issue of a public nuisance which affects the property directly adjacent (to land under the jurisdiction of the county) . We were able to talk about it. Bob Lucey said we discussed it during the sign item and public comment, which was fine. But no action should be taken on things that aren't our jurisdiction. He asked to be respectful of that.

Tom Daly asked if a citizen has an issue in relation to the other boards our commissioner isn't a member of, how do we get our views get to that board? How do we influence those representatives? Bob Lucey said the commissioners represent the entire of Washoe County. The CABs can conduct business pertaining to anything with the County. He can take those concerns to the commissioners; please bring concerns to the meeting.

Brad Stanley said meeting minutes are a legal documents, legal history. He asked how long the minutes live before they are no longer relevant. Al Rogers said they are kept for 7 years, some documents are only kept for 5 years, such as CAB records. Brad asked how are the minutes used. Al Rogers said they could be used in litigation, for previous developments for planned or future plans.

Tom Judy asked if he can go to a board meeting and disagree or say something is an issue? Bob said he could, however as an individual, not as representative of a CAB. Tom Judy asked if we can represent to a commissioners' meeting? Bob said yes, however the board would have to agree to send him to represent.

Bob Said the County has launched a beta version of a new website. He asked the CAB members for feedback.

Cliff Lowe said he had a series of questions: He said he takes blame in regards to CAB's role with sign. Relative to the sign, the way to get the info to the commissioner, you said it can be discussed during the sign item; he said (otherwise) he doesn't see the opportunity for the CAB having any discussion.

Working with Commissioner: The CAB should not be discouraged from bringing a topic forward. They should be able to have a discussion; topics should not be screened just because it's not the position the commission wants to take.

Consistencies: The CAB is not restricted to providing advice to only those the commission has authority over. All commissioners have a role in other commissions. The play in a role when discussing topics they don't necessarily have authority over. The NDOW doesn't have jurisdiction, and their input is welcome. The Commissioners can talk and have resolutions. At the last agenda, wild horses were discussed and the county doesn't have jurisdiction over wild horses; they are Federal. He said on December 9, a formal resolution was passed; did the County have jurisdiction. There are Inconsistencies; they were cherry picking on topics they wanted to discuss.

Bob Lucey said at the last meeting, during the Washoe County Sign Ordinance item, the Reno Summit Sierra sign issue was brought up in public comment. He said he can make public comment and respond to concerns. He said they are not cherry picking ideas; he said his role as commissioner is to govern in a way to represent you, and to be your voice; he said he needs your response from the CAB. He said he didn't say you can't bring it up, however, we prioritize and get through what we can. There are a lot of issues we work on with other commission. He said he doesn't want to limit a board, but make it clear how a CAB is conducted. We are doing the best we can, and work on tasks in a clear and efficient manner.

Pat said we tried to show how it affects the signage development. That is what we communicated to commissioner. Even though it was in public comment it was communicated. There are issues that don't seem to be county issues, however, they might be interlocal agreements. For instance, the wild horses; it's a safety issue. Bob said CAB acts to gather information and funnel them up to us; prioritize the issues. Any issue can be brought to them and forward to the commissioners, you just can't take action on non jurisdiction issues.

Jay Colins asked about the regulations for notifying those people who are potentially impacted; he said they want to put in a grow factory near his neighbor. Some people didn't about know this. He said if it wasn't for Bill Naylor, he wouldn't have known about the cell tower. Jay Colins talked about communication of what is happening. He said after permits are given to someone, there seems to be no enforcement to check if they are complying. In north end of Washoe Valley, there is a church where there use to be a bbq stand – were they permitted? How does this happen. He said when he asks these questions, and the county staff says they don't have the resources. He asked if we have to complain to get anything done about reinforcement. Bob said they are complaint driven in our departments. He encouraged Jay to sign up online for email blasts. Jay Colins asked the marijuana locations; he said there will be one on the north end of Washoe Valley; the map with red dots has no legends. What do the red dots mean? There are children who live in this area. How do you communicate and act responsibility regarding this impact in our community.

Sarah Tone said the topic of medical marijuana will be brought back as an update at the next meeting and can be discussed after the meeting. In regards to permits near you, for special use permit, notifications within 500 feet of the property and 30 closest residents. He encouraged him to go to [www.washoecounty.us/cmail](http://www.washoecounty.us/cmail) to receive emails on CAB, development code projects, or call our community development office. Jay Colins said the Old Washoe Estates would all like to know about this marijuana location. He said more people would avail themselves if they knew about it. Bob said they want to make sure everyone has a voice. Bob said they are complaint driven since they are 6600 sq miles with limited staff; we encourage you call us, and we will look into it.

Ginger Pierce asked if have Mr. Lucey has read the South Valleys area plan. She said they worked on that for 5 years and stood for what they wanted. She asked Mr. Lucy how he can you represent us if he doesn't know what we want. Bob and Al both said they haven't read it yet. Ginger suggested they read it.

Bill Naylor advised them to read the South Valleys Area Plan before the Verizon topic goes before the board. It is in violation of that plan.

**9. \*UPDATE: CITY OF RENO PLANNING REQUEST Case No. LDC15-00032 (Summit Sierra Master Signage Plan) –** Status update on a request to the City of Reno for a special use permit to modify freestanding sign standards of the Redfield Regional Center Plan. The site is located in the area bounded by I-580 to the north, South Virginia Street to the east and the Mt. Rose Highway to the south (Summit Mall). This item is tentatively scheduled to be heard by the City of Reno Council on February 11. Additional Information: City Staff Planner Vern Kloos, (775) 334- 4636, website: <http://renocitynv.iqm2.com/Citizens/Default.aspx> (Select appropriate December 11, Planning Commission meeting or February 11 Council Meeting). *(This item is for information only and no action will be taken by the CAB.)*

Sarah Tone gave a summary of action made by the City of Reno; it was unanimous to deny the request. There are other options the mall can take is to appeal it; 25 days in the court system. She said they can't submit a substantial project within 12 months. She said contact the City of Reno for exact working, or she can send it to you.

**10. \*DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS –** The project description is provided below with links to the application or you may visit the Planning and Development Division website and select the Application Submittals page: [http://www.washoecounty.us/comdev/da/da\\_index.htm](http://www.washoecounty.us/comdev/da/da_index.htm).

**A. OLD BUSINESS: Verizon Wireless Appeal AX14-003 re Special Use Permit SB14-002 (Verizon Wireless) –** This is an Appeal filed by Verizon Wireless of the Board of Adjustment's decision to deny Special Use Permit SB14-002. This Appeal includes an **amended request** to allow for the construction of a Wireless Communications Facility, located at 205 US Highway 395 N, Washoe Valley, NV; located on the west side of US 395, across the highway from Old Washoe Drive, Within Section 24, T17N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County. **In the Appeal before the Board of County Commissioners,**

**Verizon Wireless is offering to reduce the 100 foot high cell tower by 40 feet, resulting in a 60 foot high cell tower.**

All other aspects of Verizon's proposal will remain the same as when this proposal came before the Board of Adjustment on June 5, 2014: A faux water tank cell tower containing six antennas, and an equipment shelter containing telecommunication ground equipment, all of which shall be enclosed within a 50' x 50' fenced area on a ±35.73 acre parcel. Three easements located on the subject parcel are also included in the proposal; two of which are Verizon Wireless utility easements for overhead utility poles; and one is for a Verizon Wireless access and utility easement. Sacramento Valley LP dba Verizon Wireless. This item was previously heard by the South Truckee Meadows Washoe Valley Citizen Advisory Board on May 5, 2014 and was denied on June 5, 2014 at the Board of Adjustment.

**Applicant:** David Downs, Complete Wireless Consulting, Consultant

**Property Owner:** Washoe Valley Storage

**Location:** 205 US Highway 395 N

**Application Packet:** [http://www.washoecounty.us/comdev/da/da\\_index.htm](http://www.washoecounty.us/comdev/da/da_index.htm)

**Staff Representative:** Grace Sannazzaro, [gsannazzaro@washoecounty.us](mailto:gsannazzaro@washoecounty.us) 775-328-3771

**Tentative Hearing Date:** This Appeal is tentatively scheduled to be heard at a public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners, Tuesday, March 10, 2015.

David Downs asked to come back to the CAB. They presented to this CAB 4-5 months ago. He said the intent is to present the revised project. David gave back ground, showed the revised project, and said he is here to address any issues. David showed pictures of the previously proposed project; he showed the conceptual design of the 100 foot water; he said in order to the view on the facility, one would have to be on the private property to see it close up. He said there is a ¼ mile vantage point – closes public right away. He said the current issue is that it silhouette against the sky line and visual impacts and other issues.

David reviewed the revised project:

Newly proposed has been reduced in size to 60 feet tall. He showed new photo simulations to compare and contrast of the impact of the facility. He showed different vantage points. He showed a comparison of 20, 40, 60 foot tall tower and said they all silhouette the sky line. It's impossible not to silhouette the sky line. He showed a map indicating where the facility is visible and where it is not. The circles on the map indicate where they can be visible: Circle ¼ mile radius, 1 mile radius, 2 mile radius. A lot of green dots are within the one mile green dot radius. Configuration of the revised project: there will be the same access and utility lines as before. The access road alignment goes up the hill with the topography.

He compared the previously vs. revised plan: height and proportional water tank. This proposed project is a service objective by Verizon initiated 2 years ago; The original project was faux water tank 100 feet tall; height was selected to satisfy the service objective provide LGE. He said Verizon provides 2 networks to this area – voice and data. 850 mhz and 700 mhz LTE – you receive signal from either of those areas. Service will become an issue with capacity. People will start to experience slow internet, dropped internet connections; there will be an overload which will result in slow services. AWS - 700mhz is the next generation of technology for all wireless service. It would be added capacity. For Verizon to remain satisfied with their service, the gap in AWS needs to be resolved.

He showed the propagation map: 700mhz frequency. Service area will be compromise with this plan; it still would cover most of Washoe Valley, but doesn't allow for the service they would like to provide to the north. Still satisfying the service objectives but not at the levels they would like to provide. He showed another potential facility to provide the necessary capacity to highway and Pleasant Valley area. He showed a close up image of facility from approximately 300 feet away, which is 700 feet away from public access.

Tom Judy said he recalls the last time; this project was in violation of County code. This project proposal doesn't address the issue of county code. David said Washoe County staff can address this. There is no way to not to silhouette the sky line, and that why it was denied. We are doing our best to minimize the visual impacts. The county has the digression to make that decision.

Jim Rummings – we aren't against Verizon from erect the equipment for people to use Verizon; they want cell phone service, that's not the problem. However, there is lack of cooperation. He said you still haven't convinced us of any other alternatives. Anything 10 feet or more will be visible, and we don't want it visible. When you are on Interstate 580, you can see towers. There are already cell towers. He said Verizon picked the most visible corridor which irritates everyone. We don't feel comfortable that you don't have any another alternative. David said he respectfully disagreed; David said he can explain the process for site search process. We are here now because that this site has been the best site determined. 3 parcels were reasonably feasible for radio frequency; however, this one can meet service objectives. David said he can provide site analysis. Jim Rummings said if this is the only location, all the other telecommunication would want to put in this location as well. David said every wireless company has different objectives. He said they looked at co-locating with another service provider, but different carriers have different equipment. They have different objective and opinions on co-locating.

Pat Phillips asked about locating on public vs. private land, and if any other locations were willing to have it on their property. David said 11 parcels showed interest. He said he would be happy to show site analysis. Wireless can be on public land as long as the public entity agrees with lease agreement. Eric asked if they have entered into a lease on this parcel. David said yes. Eric said that's why you are pushing this site. Eric asked about the steamboat location. Why won't that site with towers be effective? David said the steamboat location is an existing Verizon location. There are two existing Verizon locations: steamboat and Slide Mountain. Slide Mountain was built 20 years ago. It's older facility. The way the technology is going, you need more facilities closer to the wireless device; this existing facility is out of date and not effective. They are looking to take the slide mountain facility out of commission. They are moving forward with technology. Even if Slide Mountain stays operational, this area will experience significant capacity issues. He said if and when this is approved, this proposed facility will service the same area as Slide Mountain if it gets removed.

Eric said the CAB is approaching this issue similar to those issues with signs; it's still a visual impact. It's not changing. Eric asked why is this a benefit and why should we support this. David said the Board of County Commissioners will make the ultimate decision. It won't be appealable; it will be final. The visual impact of the facility is the issue. There isn't a pine tree in the area, so a monopine won't work. The water tank seemed to fit better in this area. The photo simulations were hard to see or understand. He said the actual facility is extremely hard to see from 395. There is a small area where you would actually see the water tank. It blends as well as possible.

Brad Stanley asked about the 3 other facility alternatives. Do they meet the service objective? David handed out the alternate candidate analysis of the 3 potential locations; those were the only sites that could satisfy the service objective. This is provided to County. Slide 11 shows all 3 sites. The document explains shows the topography. This is a tricky area. We consider this area visually sensitive and a gateway. He said they have to be located in the proposed area due to the topography.

Current proposal: A lower facility at the same location and try to be as far away from the highway as possible and to make it as high quality stealth facility as possible. He said they will consider any design change suggestions. We have considered different other options. He said they feel this is best looking facility in a location that can meet service objectives. If approved on March 6; there will be another application for the Pleasant Valley Area with a smaller service objective that needs to be met. Jim Rummings asked about running a leaky feeder line up the corridor. You have plenty of holes that can be possible. Jim said they can run it up a line used in underground installations. David spoke in regards to power lines, they negotiating the rights to hang the antennas on the poles. He said in order to meet the service objectives to the south, it takes 7 microcells. They have investigated that possibility; however, it's not feasible at this time.

3:04 Bill Naylor tried to bring up reasons this was not approved before. This is a lattice tower; he said they propose this is the only location, but they will turn around and proposal another facility if this is declined. He liked Jim's suggestion. Will AWS work with our current cell phones. David said phones within the last 5 years use AWS. It will allow your phone to operate as fast as possibly can. Works well with 4g.

Ginger Pierce said they have to read the area plan. She asked how close together can you put cell towers together. David said there is a setback of 1000 feet. He said they made sure it met all constraints with zoning ordinance. There were issues with silhouetting. This facility is intended to service of 2 ½ mile diameter.

Fred Woodside is from the St. James's village; he said there are several lots affected. These lots are some of the best lots in St. James. There is nothing on that hill. No water towers, no trees. The location of that tower will affect Sierra Reflections and St. James. The property values would be reduced. He said this is a misrepresentation.

Brad Stanley asked what the planning department's position is on this project. Grace, County Planner, said this is scheduled for March 10, 6pm at the Board of County Commissioners. She said she presents the history of the project. She recommended denial based on the area plan. Her job is to give history of what happen, such as why the Board of Adjustment and CAB denied it. The Board of County Commissioners can uphold Board of Adjustments decision; they can deny it, reverse denial, approve it or approve with support appeal, and make modifications to approval. The can only offer the three motions. Tom Judy said the proposed changes don't met the area plan.

MOTION: Tom Judy moved to deny the project because it that it doesn't meet the area plans. Brad Stanley second it the motion to deny the project. The motion passed unanimously.

**11. \*CHAIRMAN/BOARD MEMBER ITEMS/NEXT AGENDA ITEMS** – This item is limited to announcements by CAB members and topics/issues posed for future workshops/agendas. Items listed will be taken into consideration for future meeting topics without guarantee for placement and timing.

- Marijuana dispensary and grow houses; the community needs to be informed.
- Complaints Department
- Washoe county Sherriff's office's financial status/forensic lab and delinquent payment.
- Consolidation of Sierra Fire and TMFPD; what is the deadline to get comments to the commissioners.
- Eric requested an update on sign ordinance with potential action. Jim said they are trying to give final draft for Board of County Commissioners approval. Eric asked about the Dianda sign. Jim said it's an exception.
- Brad Stanley requested an update on the South East Connector.

**12. \*PUBLIC COMMENT** – Limited to no more than three (3) minutes. Anyone may speak pertaining to any matter either on or off the agenda. The public are requested to submit a “Request to Speak” form to the Board Chairman. Comments are to be addressed to the Board as a whole.

Cliff Lowe expressed his appreciation and thanked the CAB members. He asked what happens with Summit sign after 12 months are up. What do you do? He said you could have had it on the agenda as a non-action item. He said other topics you can talk about that might be interest to Mr. Rogers is the annexation; the County has no say on it. Property owners can request it, and Washoe County can't say anything about it. In the CAB handbook, annexation can be address, but you were told you couldn't discuss it. He said there was difference in opinion about agenda items – there might be an item brought to the cab soon as an action item. He said the CAB has a right and the role to discuss the sign issue to decide if you agree or disagree with a particular section.

**13. \*ADJOURNMENT** – Chairperson, Patricia Phillips, made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:27pm.

Number of CAB members present: 7

Number of Public Present: 34

Presence of Elected Officials: 0

Number of staff present: 2

Submitted By: Misty Moga